



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|--|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 10/651,843 | 08/29/2003 | Richard L. Wilder | IGT1P277/P-798 | 8136 |
| 79646 7590 03/03/2009 Weaver Austin Villeneuve & Sampson LLP - IGT Attn: IGT P.O. Box 70250 Oakland, CA 94612-0250 | | | | |
| EXAMINER | | | | |
| PANDYA, SUNT | | | | |
| ART UNIT | | PAPER NUMBER | | |
| 3714 | | | | |
| MAIL DATE | | DELIVERY MODE | | |
| 03/03/2009 | | PAPER | | |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/651,843

Applicant(s)

WILDER ET AL.

Examiner

SUNIT PANDYA

Art Unit

3714

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 15 December 2008.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SG/US)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 12/15/08
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 12/15/08 has been entered.

Response to Amendment

This action is in response filed 12/15/08, wherein the applicant has amended claims 7& 15, no new claims have been added or deleted from the instant application, consequently claims 1-20 are currently pending.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claim 1-13, 15-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Itkis, and further in view of Vuong et al. (US Patent 5,762,552).

Claims 1-3, 9: Itkis teaches of a system configured to offer a wagering event to a player comprising, multiple gaming terminals, wherein each terminal contains a display to display wagering event information to the players (figure 1, wherein multiple wagering terminals with display for displaying wagering information are disclosed). Itkis also teaches each wagering terminal having a touch screen for player input (col. 1: 54-4), and a monetary/card interface to accept wager (figure 1 discloses card input for player tracking cards and all gaming terminal must definitely have a monetary input in order to activate the wagering terminal, i.e. a monetary input could be coin input, cash input, credit card input etc., further more Itkis' gaming machine contain a switch configured to communicate with each game component housed within the housing of each terminal, wherein the switch 12 on figure 2, teaches of being able to control the flow of data to each of the slave machines). Itkis teaches memory to store machine readable game codes and a single processor (the master computer in figure 1 device 1 contains a processor, col. 3: 13-34, wherein a single microprocessor, which executes game codes stored in the master device, further more, Itkis in col. 5: 55-60 teaches of concurrently transmitting games from the master device to the slave device, to be utilized by players, wherein the game being transmitted, is a blackjack or a poker game, which the players play against the each other or the house, have to be transmitted simultaneously to each slave terminal), which executes said codes to offer games and bonuses related to the games to plurality of slave game device from a master game device (col. 3: 13-34).

Itkis however fails to teach of an audio interface having multiple channels configured to communicate with multiple gaming terminals. In an analogous art of Interactive network gaming, Vuong et al. teaches of having audio interface with multiple channels configured to communicate with multiple gaming terminals, and wherein the audio channels are located within the servers which contains a processor which routes the signals are required (col. 5: 24-34). It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have modified Itkis, to include an audio interface to allow for audio signals to be sent to multiple gaming terminals thus allowing players to experience unique sounds that is synonymous with the games to enjoy their gaming experience to its fullest.

Claims 4-6, 8, 12-13, 16: Itkis teaches memory and processor being remote from the slave game terminals, wherein the processor controls multiple gaming terminals which are connected through a network (col. 3: 13-34, 3: 66-11).

Claims 7, 15 & 19: Itkis teaches master game device (Figure 1, element 1) that contains a memory to store machine readable game codes and a single processor (the master computer in figure 1 device 1 contains a processor which is controlling the entire system including information transmitted to one of plurality of slave devices, col. 3: 13-34) to execute said codes to offer games and bonuses related to the games to plurality of slave game device (col. 3: 13-34), and multiple gaming terminals to concurrently present wagering event, generated at the master device by said master game processor (further more, in col. 5: 55-60 teaches of concurrently transmitting games from the master device to the slave device, to be utilized by players, wherein the game being

transmitted, is a blackjack or a poker game, which the players play against the each other or the house, have to be transmitted simultaneously to each slave terminal), to multiple players (figure 1, wherein multiple wagering terminals with display for displaying wagering information are disclosed, further more Itkis' gaming machine contain processor which is in communications with each game component housed within the housing). Itkis teaches of having communication interface connected to the control module to send data to and receive data from the plurality of gaming terminals (col. 3: 66-11, 5: 15-32).

Itkis however fails to teach of an audio interface having multiple channels configured to communicate with multiple gaming terminals. In an analogous art of Interactive network gaming, Vuong et al. teaches of having audio interface with multiple channels configured to communicate with multiple gaming terminals, and wherein the audio channels are located within the servers which contains a processor which routes the signals are required (col. 5: 24-34). It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have modified Itkis, to include an audio interface to allow for audio signals to be sent to multiple gaming terminals thus allowing players to experience unique sounds that synonymous with the games to enjoy their gaming experience to its fullest.

Claims 10-11: Itkis teaches of master game device comprising a processor, a memory and additional expansion ports which could be used for video adapter as well as audio adapter (col. 3: 13-34, 5: 3-8).

Claims 17 & 20: Itkis teaches of a single controller controlling multiple wagering games (figure 2 master game device controlling the slave devices, col. 3: 13-34).

Claim 18: Itkis teaches wherein the control module could be a personal computer (figure 1) and each gaming terminal comprises a display and a player interface (see figure 1).

Claim 14 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Itkis and Vuong et al. as applied to claims 1-13 and 15-20 above, and further in view of Stepan et al. (US Patent 4,621,814).

Claim 14: The combination of Itkis and Vuong et al. teaches the invention substantially as claimed however, Itkis and Vuong et al. fails to teach of having multiple gaming terminals within the same housing. Stepan teaches of an amusement device housing that allows multiple gaming devices to be placed in the same housing (see figure 1 and abstract). It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have modified Itkis and Vuong to allow multiple gaming devices to be placed in the same housing to reduce space being occupied by the multiple gaming machines.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 12/15/08 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

The applicant argues that reference of Itkis does not teach all of the limitations of claim 1, specifically "a single processor configured to access the memory to execute the machine readable game code to concurrently offer a game to the first player at the first terminal and the second player at the second terminal." The examiner respectfully disagrees with the applicant, as stated above in the rejection above, Itkis teaches of a memory disclosed within the master device to store machine readable game codes and a single processor (the master computer in figure 1 device 1 contains a processor, which is running under the operating system to govern co-currently number of tasks, col. 3: 13-34, wherein a single microprocessor, which executes game codes stored in the master device), which executes said codes to offer games to plurality of slave game device from a master game device utilized by players at their respected terminals(col. 3: 13-34). Further more, Itkis (in col. 5: 55-60) teaches of concurrently transmitting games from the master device to the slave device, to be utilized by players (wherein the game being transmitted, is a blackjack or a poker game, which the players play against the each other or the house) have to be transmitted simultaneously to each slave terminal.

Regarding the applicant's arguments that, Itkis alone or in combination with Vuong or Stepan, fails to teach of a single processor transmitting a communication signal to at least one switch, and wherein each switch selectively routes the communication signal to at least one of the plurality of gaming components. The examiner respectfully disagrees with the applicant. Itkis teaches of a gaming machine

containing a switch configured to communicate with each game component housed within the housing of each terminal, wherein the switch 12 on figure 2, teaches of being able to control the flow of data to each of the slave machines.

Consequently, the applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-20 have been considered but are deemed non-persuasive, henceforth the rejection is maintained.

The examine would like to note that said examiner has cited particular columns and line numbers in the references as applied to the claims above for the convenience of the applicant. Although the specified citations are representative of the teachings in the art and are applied to the specific limitations within the individual claim, other passages and figures may apply as well. It is respectfully requested from the applicant, in preparing the responses, to fully consider the references in entirety as potentially teaching all or part of the claimed invention, as well as the context of the passage as taught by the prior art or disclosed by the examiner.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to SUNIT PANDYA whose telephone number is (571)272-2823. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8 - 5:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Peter Vo can be reached on 571-272-4690. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

SP

/Scott E. Jones/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3714